
IMPRIMATUR.

Guil. Needham.

Jan. 26.
1687.

IMPRIMATUR.

Guil. Needham.

Jan. 26.
1687.

A Plain
D E F E N C E
OF THE
PROTESTANT RELIGION,
Fitted to the
Meanest Capacity :
Being a
Full CONFUTATION
OF THE
N E T
FOR THE
Fishers of Men.

Published by two Gentlemen lately gone over to
the Church of *Rome*.

Wherein is evidently made appear, that their departure
from the *Protestant Religion* was without Cause or
Reason.

Written for publick good by *L. E.* a Son of the Church
of *England*, as by Law Established.

*Be not tossed too and fro with every Wind of Doctrine, by the
sleight of Men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie
in wait to deceive. Eph. 4. 14.*

London, Printed by *S. L.* and are to be sold by
R. Taylor, near *Stationers-Hall*, 1687.

DEFENCE

PROT. TANT. MILLION

Manell Capacity:

Full COGNITION

10/6

UNITED STATES

To Mr. J. C. and Mr. J.
M. C. The Authors of the
Net for the Fishers of Men.

Gentlemen,

I Hope that your design in publishing your little Treatise, was a zealous desire to bring others of your Countrymen into the same Church which you have made your selves Members of, out of pure Love to their Souls, which you (I suppose) think cannot be safe out of its Communion : and I am the rather induced to believe it, because you seem so confident of the strength of your Arguments, that in the Epistle Dedicatory, you reckon them unanswerable, and in that to the Reader you express your Sence of them to be very high. This I take to be an effect of your Zeal, for I am sure it is not of your Knowledge, and I would charitably persuade my self, that you love the Truth too well, to pretend a defence of what you know is Erroneous, or endeavour to promote the Progress
A 3 of

To the Authors of the Net

of delusions; but out of a sincere Heart offer the Reasons which prevailed with you to a Change, not seeing their weakness; which is indeed so very notorious, that I never thought to have seen them published, though I have often known them vigorously pressed in private Discourses, where heat and unwariness may let them pass without discovering that there is nothing of Force in them; it being generally the Practice of the Romanists, but especially the Jesuits, to have a Set of Arguments for private unstudied Adversaries, with which they catch too many, who because they carry a specious Shew at first, examine but little farther, and without consulting others, suffer themselves to be led Captive.

I have in the following Treatise, according to your Desire in the Preface, annexed my Answers to your Queries; for which reason I have done it by way of Dialogue, that so I might be the more brief, and omit nothing of what you offered.

I don't doubt but I have shewn the weakness of every particular Argument; but to save you and my self a great deal of Trouble, if you reply, I shall

For the Fishers of Men.

shall here take notice of several gross faults in your Arguing, which if they be not remedied, will create endless difficulties.

You never tell us what you mean by the word Church; in some places you take it for the Congregation of the Faithful, in others for a Council, and in others for a particular Church.

Qu. I.

41

5.

In your Allegations out of Scripture you bring many Texts, which indeed prove nothing to your purpose. Thus in a question of the universal Church, you bring a Text that speaks of a particular one, or of every private Minister. And in the question about Confirmation, in defence of Oyl, and Balm, you cite places which mention only Imposition of Hands.

Qu. 5.

41.

46.

III.

You suppose the Roman Church to be the only Church of Christ, without any Proof, which is plain begging the question, and not arguing: So in other places you beg the question:

Qu. 37,

40, 46,

47, 50,

Ec.

And you take it for granted that Peter had the chief Charge over the Apostles committed to him, that oral Tradition is Apostolical, that God hath commanded nothing concerning a Liturgy in an unknown Tongue: and that because Reliques

Qu. 54.

55.

64.

To the Authors of the Net

89. *have been the Instruments by which Miracles were wrought, therefore they must be Worshipped.*

- You mistake the Question, and run on upon a Point not contested ; which is arguing to no purpose , nothing but making a Puppet , and knocking him down. Thus when the Question is about Praying in an unknown Tongue, you*
- Qu. 66. *argue for the lawfullness of speaking with Tongues ; in the point of Free Will you plead for Free Will in Moral actions , which we acknowledge, when the question is about those Actions that are Spiritual : again you argue against Faith without Works, when*
95. *the question is, whether Faith alone*
96. *justifies, not whether Faith can be*
97. *without Works ; for that we deny as well as you. So in the point of Religious*
102. *Vows, you argue for the lawfullness of*
103. *Vows in general, when the Controversy is*
104. *about those particular Vows, which we Condemn.*

You quote several Scriptures famous, not only as to the particular references, of which there are a Multitude, so many that I am afraid you took them up upon Trust ; but also the very Texts. Thus you make St. Paul call Marriage a Sacrament, when he calls it only

117.

for the Fishers of Men.

a Mystery ; so you have falsified, Heb. 12 11. and several other places, as I have proved in the Book it self.

84.

I might add several Instances of these and other Particulars, such as your taking the word Universal in three several Sences, and yet applying all Qu. 11. one way, but these shall suffice, and You take I am in hopes will let you see how Universal wretchedly your Pretended Fathers for being have dealt with you, by putting such in all Placing Arguments upon you, and found-ces. ing your Faith upon such weak Qu. 12. Grounds. You take it

I desire you would not take it ill that for being I attribute this work to some of existent at them, and do so freely tax you with not all times, seeing the Vanity of it ; for I suppose &c. you are Gentlemen, whose Education Qu. 13. hath engrossed your time to other Mat- You take it ters, and cannot therefore be reasonably for being supposed to have sufficient Experi-called V- ence in these Points to make you able to niversal. discern their Sophisms, and uncluding Arguments, which they have shammd upon you for convincing Reasons.

If you are convinc'd by this answer, I shall bless God for it ; if not, I desire you would satisfy the World why you are not : But don't follow the Method,

To the Authors of the Net, &c.

thods of some late Writers, who have wisely withdrawn from the main Business, and only cavilled at a word or two, as being Improper, or something of that Nature, when they could not answer the Reasons of their Adversaries, nor defend their own: I might easily have done so by you, but as I have dealt seriously and plainly, I expect the same, and I pray God send us his Holy Spirit to lead us into all Truth. I am,

Gentlemen,

Your very humble

Servant,

L. E.

T O

TO THE
Reader,

Courteous Reader,

A *Serious Enquiry* and search after *Truth* is the *Duty* of every rational *Creature*, and he that hath an *unfeign- ed desire* to find it, and *happiness* in it, will not *neglect* any *lawful means* to arrive at the *knowledge* of it ; seeing by it the *Mind* is *enlightened*, our *Faith* *regulated* and *fixed*, and our *actions* *guided* to that *true felicity*, which *Crowns* the *Soul* with *Peace* here, and *Bliss* hereafter. The *Con- sideration* of *this*, when duly weigh- ed, can never *fail* of putting us on *En- quiry*, how we shall *attain* it. The *Taylor* was no sooner *awakened*, but he puts the question, *what shall I do?* Acts 16. and we have this *Encouragement* to prosecute the *Search*, that if we *seek*, we shall surely *find*, and the *Holy Spirit* shall *guide us into Truth*.

Of

To the Reader.

Of all the *Papers* lately published by the *Gentlemen* of the *Romish* Church, I find none which seems more *earnestly* to seek *Truth*, than this which I have here answered, and I am not so *uncharitable* as to doubt at all of the *Sincerity* of the *Authors* Profession, in the *Epistle*; but I must say they have not taken the *right Course*; these *Queries* should have been put *before* they *turned*; which if they had, I believe their now *Ghostly Fathers* had missed their *Proselytes*; therefore I desire of thee, *Reader*, that if any *Reply* be made to this *Treatise*, or if some *Emissaries* should attempt thee *privately* in defence of what I have here answered, thou wouldest *Suspend thy Judgment* till I have time to *Reply*, or else consult some *learned Divine*, and then I am sure there is no danger of thy *Perversion*, if thou retainest a *sincere* desire to find the *Truth*; the want of that *Caution* hath perverted several, within my *Knowledg*; the *Priests* industriously keeping those, whom they design upon, from such *Helps*, by urging the *plainness* of their *Arguments*, which often catch *unconsidering* Persons.

For

To the Reader

For thy *Benefit* I have answered every *Argument*, which my *Adversaries* offer, setting it first down in their own *Words*. So that all the *Papist* speaks, is the words of their *Book*, which I have therefore caused to be Printed in a *different* Letter; I have been *brief* in my *Answers*, yet *plain* and *full*; if any *reply* be made, I desire it may be done with the same *Calmness* I have used, and without *running* from the *question*; if any *particular* be *proved Erroneous*, I here promise to *recant* it, for I write not out of *Prejudice* or *Passion*, God is *Witness*; but a *desire* to find the *Truth*; and I shall receive so much *Satisfaction* from being *better informed*, that I shall not be *ashamed* to *learn*. My *Adversaries* profess the *same*. I beg of them, they would *keep* to it, I promise *nothing* but *plain Evidence* of *Truth* shall *prevail* with me, I hope the *same* of them: that if they find the *Motives* of their *Change* weak and *frivolous*, as I think I have made them *appear* to be, they will not be *ashamed* to make *abetter*.

Since my *Answer* was finished, there came forth a *Treatise*, pretending

To the Reader.

Seek and tending to search into the Grounds of ye shall Religion, which is much to the same find. purpose with that I have here answered, and I don't know any Material passage in it but what thou wilt find resolved here: it is dressed up with a little more Art than my Adversaries, and consequently with less Sincerity.

Epist. Ded. One of the great Charges which they draw up against us is, That we follow the *Private Spirit*; a word which they make much use of, but I don't know what they mean by it; if they intend to blame us for expecting the assistance of the Spirit of God, in teaching, and instructing us; let them prove that God hath not promised it, and we are not to expect it, if they can: but if they mean (as I suppose) the believing nothing but what Sense and Reason tells us is from God; if it be this they call the *private Spirit*, at the same time they find fault with us, they condemn themselves: for it is no more than what they must necessarily follow in Reading their Councils, Gatechisms, and Fathers, or in hearing their Preachers; "for we do not use our Reason in the
"examining the Truth of what God hath said:

To the Reader.

“said; but in examining *what* it is
 “that he hath said; and let *them* shew
us another way to come to the knowledge
 of *his Will*; and they will do *more*
 than their infallible Councils ever thought
 of.

I would willingly take away all
 occasion of disputing about Words, for
 which reason I desire thee to take
 notice, that because I would not puz-
 zle the unlearned Reader with hard
 Words. I have called several Passa-
 ges, METAPHORS in the
 61st. Query, which are indeed ME-
 TONYMIES; but the other
 term being more generally understood,
 I chose to use it, which I hope my
 Adversaries will take notice of, and
 not wrangle about the Propriety of the
 Expression, when there is no need of it.

I cannot but take notice what won-
 derful Reverence my Adversaries and
 their Church, pretend to have for the
 Fathers; and yet these Gentlemen,
 Quer. 73. Charge several of them
 with Blasphemy: for say they, if you
 say, Christ descended into the Hell of the
 Damned, then you Blaspheme, and yet
 St. Austin (Ser. 120. de tempore: lib.
 12. de Genesi ad litteram c. 33. & E-
 pist. 57. ad Dardan. & Epist. 59. ad Euo-
 diam,

To the Reader.

dian, and St. Jerome (*Commen. in Zachar. c. 9. verse 11.*) teaches that he descended to the Hell of the Damned, even to the Hell where Divels was punished. So that though the Author of *Nubes Testium*, P. 208, 209. censures the Protestants for rejecting the Fathers in some things; yet we find they only are not to be blamed for it; for these Gentlemen and the Jesuits who approved their Book, charge them with Blasphemy; which is a something bolder way of treating them, than what that Author accuses them of, but 'tis no unusual thing with them; for I can make it appear, that there is not one of the Fathers of the first five Ages, nay scarce any of latter Date, but are censured and rejected, and accused of Ignorance and Error, by the greatest of the Romanists.

I will trespass upon thy Patience no longer, but with my Hearty Prayers to the God of Truth, that he would remove Prejudice from thy Heart, and clearly discover the Truth to thee, as it is in Jesus. I commend thee to God, and rest,

Thy Servant,

L. E.

INTRODUCTION.

IF you had not left the *State of the Question* wholly untouched, and made use of *general Terms*, without *explaining* in what *Sence* you intended to have them *understood*, when the whole *Controversy* depended upon the right *acceptation*, you would have proceeded with greater *Candor* than I could ever yet find any of your *Authors* shewed.

Thus you make severall *Dilemma's* upon the *Church*, the *Visibility* and *Unity* of it, but never tell us what you mean by the *Church*: But seeing you speak of the *Church of Christ in general*, in your first *Dilemma*, I suppose you intended that *Church*, which is thus defin'd by the *Catechism ad Parochos* out of *St. Austin*, (*Par. 1. Pag. 77. Edit. Lug. ann. 1676*) *The Church is the faithful People dispersed throughout the whole World.*

Now in this *Sence*, I answer to your *DILEMMA's* by way of *DIALOGUE*.

1. **P**A. God hath a *Church* in the *World*, or he hath not.
Pro. He hath.

Pa. Then yours is the true *Church*, or it is not.

Pro. If by our *Church* you mean those who in *opposition* to the *Roman* are termed the *Reformed*; I answer that it doth not follow that they are either the true *Church*, or not: for they may be and are a part of it, and thus in the name of all *Protestants*, I affirm we are a part of the true *Church*.

Pa. If yours is the true *Christian Church*, then it must have these following *Marks*, *Visibility*, *Unity*, *Universality*, *Sanctity*.

Pro. I told you before we are not the whole, but a part of the true *Church*, for we dare not, as you do, exclude all from *Salvation*, who are not in all things of our *Profession*: and therefore to find whether we be a part of it or no, we are not to look for these *Marks*, but for the *Conformity* of our *Dollrines* with the *Word of God*;

or if we should allow these for *Marks* of the *true Church*, the way to know whether we be *part of the true Church* or no, is to enquire whether we *teach* the same *Doctrine*, which we are to prove by the *Holy Scriptures*, according to that of *St. Austin*, (*De Unit. Eccl. c. 16.*) *Let them shew whether they have the Church only by the Canonical Books of the divine Scriptures.* But we deny these to be the *Marks* of the *true Church*.

Of Visibility, a *Mark* of the *Church*.

2. **P**A. The *House of our Lord* shall be prepared on the top of *Mountains*, or it shall not.

Pro. It shall, *Isa. 2. 2.*

Pa. Why then do you deny that the *Church* shall be always visible?

Pro. Because that Text (*Isai. 2. 2.*) is no Promise of a *Perpetual visibility*, but only of a time when it shall be so, and so it was in the *Primitive times*, but it doth not say, it shall never cease to be so visible. Where by visible I mean, that the *true Church* shall be always in sight, so as by its external *Glory* to be known to be the *true Church*; and this that Text doth not promise; for it will not follow, that because the *Church* shall be so, therefore it shall be always so; and if it be not always so, it can be no mark.

3. Pa. A *City* seated on an *Hill* can be hid, or not.

Pro. It cannot.

Pa. Then the *Church* cannot be invisible. *Mat. 5. 14.*

Pro. That doth not follow: for in the Judgment of divers *Fathers*, this place is not spoken of the *Church*, but the *Apostles*, or the good Works of *Christians*. But if it be understood of the *Church*, all that it proves is, that it cannot be hid, as long as it is seated upon an *Hill*; but it doth not follow that it shall be always seated there.

4. Pa. *Christ* either founded a *Church* on *Earth* that all *Nations* may be edified therein, or he did not.

Pro. He did.

Pa. Why then do you say the *Church* may be invisible, since all *Nations* cannot be edified in a *Church* unseen? *Isai. 2. 2.* All *Nations* shall flow unto her, *Psal. 86. 9.* All *Nations*

Nations whatsoever thou hast made, shall come and adore before thee.

Pro. Because there is no Promise that the Church shall be evident to all Nations at all times, but that there shall come a time when it shall be so: but it doth not say it shall be so always; but it shall be evident so as to edify all Nations in God's time.

5. Pa. A Man for not hearing the Church, is termed in Scripture an Heathen, and a Publican or not,

Pro. He is. Mat. 18. 18. He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen or Publican.

Pa. How then shall a Man be termed an Heathen or Publican for not hearing a Church, that was not visible, or yet extant in the World?

Pro. This Text is nothing to the purpose, and that upon two accounts.

1. Because the question is, Whether the true Church be always visible to those who are not Members of it, as Heathens, Infidels, &c. Now this Text speaks only of those who are Members of it; to these it is always visible, but not to those.

2. Because the question is, whether the Universal Church be always visible; but this Text speaks of a particular Congregation: and therefore is not to the purpose; seeing if it proves any Church always visible, it proves every particular Congregation to be so: but as it is plain that these Arguments do not prove that the Church is to be always visible; so neither do you at all prove that if it were so, it would be a Mark of the true Church, seeing Pagan and Jewish Churches can plead Visibility, and yet it doth not follow they are the true Church, because they have it.

Of Unity, as a Mark of the true Church.

6. PA. A natural Unity and Connection of the parts among themselves, and to the Head is necessary for the Conservation of the Body, or it is not.

Pro. It is.

Pa. If it be, Why is that natural Connection proper to a natural Body, and not a Spiritual Connection proper to a Spiritual Body?

Pro. A Spiritual Connection is proper to a Spiritual Body: but this is nothing to the Purpose, as a proof that Unity is a Mark of the true Church: for this Connection of the Spiritual Body must be an Union and Connection of each part in sound Doctrine; now we must know what Doctrine is sound, before we can know whether the Parts be united in it.

7. Pa. Christ promised that there should be Unity in his Church, John 10. 16. or he did not.

Pro. He did.

Pa. If he did, why do you deny Unity?

Pro. We do not deny it, we maintain it: but we deny it to be a Mark of the Church: which it cannot be, seeing this Unity must be either in true Doctrine or in false; it cannot be in false: if it be in true, we must first know which is true, before we can know whether it be the Unity Christ promised.

8. Pa. Unity is either requisite in Gods Church, or not.

Pro. It is.

Pa. Why do you then deny the necessity of Unity?

Pro. We do not deny it to be necessary, we maintain that without Unity, in all points of Faith, there can be no Church; but it will not follow, that because it is necessary, it is a Mark whereby Heathens may know the Church; seeing other pretended Churches have Unity as well as the Christian: and nothing can be a Mark which is not proper to it alone.

9. Pa. Christ when he Prayed, his Prayer took effect, or it did not.

Pro. It did.

Pa. If it did, then Christs People are one.

Pro. They are so. What then? but it doth not thence follow that Unity is or can be a Mark to know the Church by. Where pray remember I speak of such a Mark, whereby those who are not of the Church may know her, to be the true Church.

Of Universality, as a Mark of the true Church.

10. **PA.** To be Universal or Coexistent with Time and Place, is a Mark of the true Church, or it is not.

Pro. I could wish you would a little explain what you mean by those Terms; if you mean as Bellarmine and the Catechism ad Parochos, that to be called Universal, is a Mark of the True Church; or if you intend that to be existent every where, be a Mark of it, I answer it is not.

Pa. Why then does the Scripture say, Matth. 28. 20. Go ye teach all Nations, &c. And behold I am with you even to the Consummation of the World. And again, Ephes. 4. 12. He gave some Apostles, &c. to the Consummation of the Saints?

Pro. The Scripture says so, because under the Gospel the Church was not limited to the Nation of the Jews, but all Nations might be Members of it: and there should be a Church to the end of the World; but it doth not therefore say this Church should be in all Nations, at all times, much less doth it say that its being so is a Mark that it is the True Church. Besides that Text of St. Paul, Ephes. 4. 12, 13. is spoken of the perfection of the Saints in Holiness, not of the consummating their Number, tho' if it were, it says nothing of the Name Universal, or the Churches existing every where, being a Mark to know it by.

11. **Pa.** The Church of God is either Universal, or co-existent with all time, or not.

Pro. It is. John 14, 15, 16. The Comforter shall abide with you for ever. Luke 1. 33. He shall Reign in the House of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.

Pa. If it be, why do you deny Universality?

Pro. Before you took Universality in one Sense, now in another, That the Church shall abide for ever; and this Universality we do not deny; but we deny it to be a Mark of the true Church, and that for this Reason, because it cannot be known what Church shall endure for ever, till the end of all things; matter of Future Duration being impossible to be known, till the time is finished; for how can you know before-hand what will endure for ever? the true Church will endure for ever; but you must first

know which of all the Pretenders to it is the true, before you can know which shall endure for ever. * This therefore cannot be a Mark of the true Church. For the Marks of a thing are always present, but this Duration is not present, but to come, and therefore cannot be a Mark.

12. Pa. Christ's Church is Universal or co-existent with all places, or it is not.

Pro. You seem here to mean that Christ's Church is dispersed over all the World, in all places; and if so, I say it is not.

Pa. How then can it be true, that their sound went over all the Earth, or how can all Nations be taught?

Pro. All Nations shall be taught; but there is no necessity that they should be so at all times; or that the Church should be always dispersed in all Nations; So that this can be no Mark, because a Mark must be always evident, but it was not evident in the beginning of Christianity, nor is not now in many places.

13. Pa. The Church of Christ is either Universal or Catholick, or it is not.

Pro. What mean you by its being Universal, or Catholick? If you mean as we do in the Creed, that it comprehends all the true Professors of the Gospel, I say it is.

Pa. Why then do you renounce Universality?

Pro. We do not renounce it, we only say it is no Mark: for seeing the Catholick Church, is that Church which comprehends all true Christians, we must first know who are true Christians, before we can know, what Church comprehends them.

Of Sanctity, as a Mark of the true Church.

14. Pa. The Church of Christ, is eminent for Sanctity of Discipline and Doctrine, or it is not.

Pro. It is.

Pa. Why then do you deny Sanctity in the Church?

Pro. We do not deny it, we affirm it, that is, Holiness and Purity of Doctrine, to be the mark of the true Church: and we desire it may be tryed whether we are not of the true Church by that Rule.

15. Pa.

15. Pa. *The Church of Christ is either Sanctified, or She is not.*

Pro. *The Church of the Elect is Sanctified, but the Church of visible Professors is not; yet the Doctrine of it is indeed Holy, as to the Foundation, in which respect, we do not deny Sanctity in the Church.*

16. Pa. *The Church of Christ is manifested to be Holy by the Grace of Miracles, or she is not.*

Pro. *The Grace of Miracles is a new Grace, which I understand not: and I believe, neither do you; but for the gift of Miracles, I say that is not a Mark of the Sanctity of the Church.*

Pa. *Why then did Christ say, Joh. 14. 12. &c. He that believes in me, the Works that I do he shall do, and greater?*

Pro. *Christ said so, because he gave the Holy Spirit to his Followers, and a power of working Miracles as long as it was necessary; but it doth not follow, that it is so always, much less doth it follow, that they are a Mark to know the Holiness of the Church by; seeing Antichrist is to do miracles, and the Holy Fathers tell us, Hereticks did many, yet their miracles will not prove the Sanctity of their Church.*

17. Pa. *Christ either granted true Believers the Grace of Casting out Devils, or he did not.*

Pro. *Christ did not grant that Power to all true Believers.*

Pa. *Why then do you belye the Scriptures? Mar. 16, 17.*

Pro. *We do not belye them: that Text is not spoken of all, at all times, that do believe: and this you must grant, or else affirm, that none are saved, but them who work Miracles: which is absurd and false. That Power was given in the Beginning of the Church, because it was necessary, but you cannot prove it so now: However we do not deny that God can work miracles by the Hands of his Faithful Servants, when he pleases, but we do deny that they either are, or can be a mark to find the true Church, or its Holiness by: and you cannot prove that God ever intended or promised that they should be so. The true way, to find the Church, is to examine the Holy-*

ness, and Purity of its Doctrine, and on this we rest our Cause, that ours is Pure and Holy, and therefore we are of the true Church.

18. Pa. *Your Church hath these abovementioned Marks, or she hath not; and if not, she is false.*

Pro. *That doth not follow, for they are not the marks of the true Church, as I have proved; Holiness indeed is a mark of the true Church, that is, Holiness of Doctrine, and that we affirm we have, which is a sufficient Answer to the rest of your Queries; however let us hear them.*

19. Pa. *Your Church hath been apparent or visible, ever since Christ, or it hath not; and if not, she is false.*

Pro. *Our Church hath been always visible to its Members; though as a distinct Congregation, not to those who were not Members of her, but it is not therefore true, that it is false; for visibility, I have proved not to be a mark of the true Church.*

20. Pa. *Your Church either did appear before Luther and Calvin, or it did not.*

Pro. *It did.*

Pa. *If she did, in what Kingdom or Nation was your Doctrine Preached, or by whom?*

Pro. *Our Doctrine was Preached by Christ and his Apostles, and by the ancient Fathers, in all Nations, wherever the Gospel came, and this we are ready to prove.*

21. Pa. *Martin Luther and John Calvin were the first Founders of your Church, or they were not.*

Pro. *They were not.*

Pa. *If not; produce any that ever professed the same Articles with you before them.*

Pro. *We do produce Christ and his Apostles with the general Consent of the Fathers for the first five Hundred Years after Christ; and even when the Church was hid in Babylon, and fled into the Wilderness, from the Tyranny of Antichrist, there were Multitudes who professed the same as we do.*

22. Pa. *Luther and Calvin either separated themselves from the World, or they did not; if they did, then they departed from the visible Christian Religion.*

Pro. *I never heard before, that to depart from the World,*

World, which is the Duty of every good Christian, was to depart from the Christian Religion: it was always accounted a Cleaving to it; but I suppose you mean, they departed from the Church, or they did not, and then I answer, they did not; they departed not from the Christian Church, nay, not from the Roman Church; but only from the errors of it: for we still profess a Communion with all the Orthodox, living in the Communion of that Church; nay at that time the Church was visible in the Waldenses, &c. from whom they separated not: so that they departed not from the visible Church, though if they had, they had done no more than what the People of God are commanded to do, in obedience to that Call, Rev. 18. 4. Come out of Babylon, my People.

Pa. If they did not, who joyned with them, or to whom did they adhere?

Pro. All who obeyed that Call of God, whose Eyes God opened to see, and whose Hearts he encouraged to leave those Corruptions they lived under: all these joined with them: and for the other question, To whom did they adhere? I answer, they adhered to Christ and his Apostles, and the triumphant Church in Heaven, to the Doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and to all those who had shaken off the Corruptions of Rome: Who were at that time in Bohemia, Germany, Piedmont, France, England, &c. many Thousands; they adhered likewise to the Eastern Churches who never acknowledged the Pope, nor were polluted with the Corruptions of Rome. Lastly, they adhered to all who lived in the Communion of Rome, and were not tainted with the Corruptions of it.

23. Pa. Your Church either hath Unity, or it hath not.

Pro. It hath.

Pa. Why then are there so many Sects and Schisms among you?

Pro. There are none who differ in essential Points: In which Unity of Doctrine consists: as for those Sects who do differ in essentials, they are none of our Church, but the Spawn of Yours, as we can prove.

24. Pa. All your Reformers did either agree in matters of Faith, or they did not.

Pro.

Pro. They did: All those who we own to be of our Church, did.

Pa. Why did they so much differ in essential Points?

Pro. They did not differ in any Essential Points.

25. Pa. Luther and Calvin were either true Reformers, or they were not: If not, then you follow false Reformers.

Pro. They were true Reformers. But if they were not, you can bring no Argument against us, for we follow them no farther than they followed Christ.

Pa. If they were, why did they differ in the most essential Point of the Holy Sacrament?

Pro. They do not differ in an essential Point; their difference there, is not Essential, they both agree that Christ is Present, but for the manner of his Presence, it is no essential Point.

Pa. But they differ in the Government of the Church.

Pro. They do not differ in any essential Matter in that Point, even according to your own Principles.

26. Pa. All your Reformation either do agree, or they do not.

Pro. All our Reformation do agree in essential Points; as for others, who call themselves Reformers, but are not, we have nothing to say to them.

Pa. If they do produce any two that agree in all Points.

Pro. All of them agree in all necessary Points, and I challenge you to produce any differences in such Points among us; the difference we have about lesser questions, are greater among you than us.

27. Pa. Your Church either is Universal, or it is not?

Pro. I have proved that Universality is no mark of the true Church; and therefore the question is impertinent: we do not say we are the Catholick Church, but a part of it, and this we are ready to prove; but it is not necessary to shew any of our Preachers in Japonia, &c. For the same question might be put to the Christian Church in the ancient times, before many Nations were converted; and to your Church it self, at the first discovery of America; shew one of your Preachers in those Countries.

28. Pa. Your Church hath either converted Nations, or she hath not.

Pro.

Pro. She hath.

Pa. If she hath, shew one Nation that she hath ever converted.

Pro. All Nations converted by the Apostles, and Primitive Christians, or by the true Church in any Age, were converted by that Church, of which we are a part: New-England, and many other Parts of the West-Indies, with several Places in the East, have in particular been Converted by the Protestants.

29. Pa. Your Church either hath been Universal, or it hath not: If not, She is not the true Church.

Pro. I told you before, we are only a part of the true Church; and for the question, Whether it be Universal or not; it hath been as Universal as the true Church hath been; but I would willingly know what you mean by Universal; for if you mean in all places, we deny it to be a Mark of the true Church, as I proved before.

Pa. What time hath your Church been coexistent before Luther and Calvin?

Pro. I told you just now, our Church was existent in the Apostles, and Primitive times, and ever since, though not so visible as then. If you mean any thing else by the term Coexistent, when you explain it, I will give you a farther Answer; which is a clear Answer to the next Query, 30. In whatever Place the Apostles and Primitive, and Orthodox Christians were, there was our Church, and this we are ready to prove.

31. Pa. Your Church hath Sanctity, or it hath not.

Pro. It hath.

Pa. If she hath, shew one of yours that ever was Canoniz'd.

Pro. That is an impertinent question: How comes Canonization to be a note of the Churches Sanctity? and where did ever God command it? So that it cannot be an Evidence of the Churches Sanctity, but is indeed a meer invention of Men; but our Sanctity we will prove by the Word of God, because we teach the same Doctrine which that contains.

32. Pa. Luther and Calvin, and the rest of your Reformers, confirmed their Doctrine with Miracles, or they did not.

Pro,

Pro. What if they did not?

Pa. *If they did not, they were not true Apostles.*

Pro. The *Doctrine* they *Preached* was *not theirs*, but that which *Christ* and *his Apostles* taught, and confirm'd by *Miracles*; so that it needed no more Confirmation: except we had received it upon their Authority, which we did not: We acknowledge they were *not Apostles*, as the twelve were; and therefore no need of their working *Miracles*.

33. Pa. *The Signs which Christ said in Scripture, followed your pretended Reformers, or they did not.*

Pro. All the *Signs* which *Christ* said, should always accompany the true Preachers of the Gospel, did follow them.

Pa. *If they did, shew one Man they dispossessed, or one sick that they restored to Health: for if these Signs did not follow them, they are not true Believers.*

Pro. That doth not follow, for *Christ* never made that a *Sign* of *True Believers*; nay, you must confess that many never worked any of these *Miracles*, who are yet true Believers. If indeed they had *Preached* any new *Doctrine*, you might call for *Miracles*, but seeing they *Preached* none new, but the *Doctrine* that was taught by *Christ*, his *Apostles*, and the *Ancient Fathers*, there is no need to confirm that by *Miracles*, seeing all the *Miracles* *Christ*, and his *Apostles* wrought, were for that end. However we can shew many certain instances of Mens being dispossessed, by the *Prayers* of the *Faithful* in our Church; and many among us who have had their *Health* restored them in answer to their own and the Churches *Prayers*: but for all that we have better grounds for our *Faith*, which we rest upon.

34. Pa. *Your Reformers were either famous for their virtuous Lives, or they were not.*

Pro. They were.

Pa. *If they were; why did they break their Vows made to God, and teach Men so to do?*

Pro. The *Vows* which they broke, were unlawful *Vows*, and your own *Canons* expressly say, that an unlawful *Vow* ought to be broken; (C. 22. qu. 4. c. in malis.)

malis.) by breaking then their Vow of single Life, that is, by repenting of it, and not observing it, they did no more than what they were in duty bound to do: and therefore were holy Men for all that?

35. Pa. The Catholick Roman Church and no other stands firm and infallible, against all the Tempests of Apostasie, Heresy and Schism.

Pro. The Roman Church is not firm nor infallible, but as to the visible part of it, is fallen both by Apostasie, Heresy, and Schism.

36. Pa. The Romans had once the true Church, or they had not.

Pro. The question is Ambiguous; if you mean by it that the Roman Church was the true Church, as the Mother of all other, I deny it: if you mean that the Roman Church was a true Church, and had the true Faith; I answer that she had the true Faith.

Pa. If the Romans had the true Faith, they retain the same still infallibly, or do not.

Pro. They do not.

37. Pa. If they do not, then they must have their fall, either by Apostasie, Heresie, or Schism.

Pro. She hath fallen by them all.

Pa. The Ancient, Apostolick, Catholick, Roman Church, fell by Apostasie, or it did not.

Pro. The Ancient, Apostolick, Catholick Church, fell not at all: Nay the Ancient Roman Church fell not: but the present Roman Church is fallen.

Pa. If she is fallen by Apostasie, what prudent man will say that she ever renounced the sweet Name of Jesus, which she ever bath in so great Veneration?

Pro. She may have fallen by Apostasie, and yet not, have renounced the Name of Jesus, so that her having it in so great Veneration, is no Argument that she is not fallen by Apostasie.

38. Pa. The Roman Church fell by Heresie, or she did not.

Pro. She did.

Pa. If she did, by what General Council was she ever Condemn'd? which of the Fathers ever wrote against her? Or by what Authority was she otherwise reprov'd?

Pro.

Pro. If nothing be an *Heresy* but what a *General Council* condemns, then those *Heresies* which sprang up in the first three hundred years, were wrongfully esteemed such in those times, seeing there was then no *General Council*: If a *Doctrine* may be *Heretical* which was never *Condemned* by a *general Council*, then the *Doctrines* of the *Church of Rome* may be *Heretical*, though never *Condemned* by a *General Council*, so that question doth not vindicate her from being guilty of *Heresie*.

Pa. But, which of the *Fathers* ever wrote against her?

Pro. All the *Ancient Fathers* disclaim those *Doctrines* which the *Roman Church* now holds: but they could not write purposely against her, because she did not then profess those *Doctrines*. But if it be a good *Argument*, the *Church of Rome* fell not into *Heresy*, because no *Father* wrote purposely against her; then the same *Argument* will vindicate us, seeing no *Father* hath writ against us: but if no *Father* had writ against the *Church of Rome*, she might be *Heretical* for all that, so that this question and the former are both impertinent.

Pa. But by what *Authority* was she reproved?

Pro. By the *Authority* of the *Scriptures*, by the *Authority* of the *Testimony* of the *Ancient Church*, and the *Authority* of right *Reason*.

39. Pa. The *Ancient Roman Church* fell by *Schism*, and by dividing herself from some other *Church*, or she did not.

Pro. She did.

Pa. If she did, whose company did she leave? from what *Body* did she go forth? Where was the true *Church* she forsook?

Pro. She forsook the *Primitive Church*, the *Eastern Church*, and all those *Christians* who always maintained their *Freedom* from the *Roman Yoke*.

40. Pa. The true *Holy Apostolick Catholick Church* is fallible, and can err, or it cannot.

Pro. Remember by the *Church* I mean the *Faithful* throughout the *World*, and of these I say, they all cannot err in any point of *Faith*.

Pa. Why do you then falsely condemn her?

Pro. We do not condemn her, we are part of her, but for the *Roman Church*, we condemn her.

41. Pa.

41. Pa. The Church of God is infallible in all her Proposals, and Definitions of Faith, or she is not.

Pro. All Definitions made by the whole Church of Christ, are infallibly true.

Pa. If she be, why do you deny infallibility?

Pro. The Infallibility we deny, is that of a Pope or Council; and this we deny, because they are not the whole Church, and therefore though the Church of Christ be infallible, yet they are not.

42. Pa. Christ being the Head of the Church, and the Holy Ghost the Soul of the Church, guiding and directing the Church in all Truth; she can err, or she cannot.

Pro. She cannot.

Pa. Then she is not fallible.

Pro. The Church of Christ is not fallible; but the Roman Church is,

43. Christ is either a true Prophet, or he is not.

Pro. He is.

Pa. If he be, how then can the Gates of Hell prevail against the Church? Seeing he prophesied in St. Matt. 16.

18. The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.

Pro. The Gates of Hell cannot prevail against the Church, nor never shall; that is, they shall not prevail against the whole Church, but against any particular Church; as the Church of Rome, they may and have prevailed. But here, as in the rest of your Queries, you beg the question, supposing the Church of Rome to be the only Church of Christ.

44. Pa. The Holy Ghost suggesteth all truth to the Church, or it doth not.

Pro. It doth.

Pa. If it doth, then it will suggest no Errors.

Pro. It will not: But that doth not hinder, but it may permit Satan to suggest Errors to a particular Church; this you will allow; and therefore to the Church of Rome, which is but a particular Church.

45. Pa. Christ was a wise Man, or he was not.

Pro. He was.

Pa. Why then did he build his House upon the Sand, and make it subject to the infernal Tempests.

Pro.

Pro. He did not build his House upon the Sand, nor did he make it subject, that is, he did not subject it to the infernal Tempests; but he made it liable to them, yet still he defeats their force: and though he suffers them to overthrow some outer parts of it, yet the House it self shall never be overthrown.

46. Pa. A Congregation of People in despising Christ, are guilty of Apostasie, or they are not.

Pro. If they were People that professed Christ before, then they are guilty of Apostasie in despising him; but not else: if they never Professed Christ, they are guilty of horrible Sin, but not of Apostasie.

Pa. If they be, how can you clear your selves of Apostasie in despising his Church? seeing it is said in Scripture, Luke 10. 16. He that beareth you, beareth me, &c.

Pro. We do not despise the Church: it is you despise her, by teaching so many things contrary to her Doctrine, as we are ready to prove.

47. Pa. Your Church is guilty of Heresie, or she is not.

Pro. She is not.

Pa. If not, how doth the Definition of Heresie agree with you, in adhering to so many singular and private Opinions, and Errors of Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Catholick Church.

Pro. It doth not agree at all to us; we teach no such private and singular Opinions; the Doctrines we teach, are the received Doctrines of the Catholick Church; but it agrees very well to you, whose Doctrines wherein we dissent from you, are such private and singular Opinions, and contrary to the received Doctrine of the Catholick Church; and this we will at any time prove.

48. Pa. Your Church is guilty of Schism, or it is not.

Pro. It is not.

Pa. How then doth the Definition of Schism agree with you, in dividing your selves from the Body of all Faithful Christians, and in breaking Communion with the Ancient, Apostolick, Catholick, Roman Church?

Pro. It doth not agree to us: we made no such Division, we indeed divided our selves from the corrupt Roman Church, but we never divided from the Ancient Apostolick

Pollick Church, but you did, and this I am ready to make good; See here again you beg the question, and suppose the Roman Church the only Church of Christ, which is the point in Controversie, and you can never prove.

49. Pa. *That Church to which Apostasie, Heresy, and Schism agree, is a false Church, or she is not.*

Pro: *She is.*

Pa. *Then your Church is a false Church, seeing they so aptly agree with her.*

Pro. *They do not agree with her, but rather with you, as I have proved. Therefore she is no false Church.*

50. Pa. *All that which the Ancient holy Catholick Roman Church holds as Articles of Faith, is pious, good, and lawful.*

Pro. *All that the Ancient holy Catholick Church held, is pious, good, and lawful, and so is all that the Ancient holy Roman Church held, for she held nothing but what the Catholick Church held, but all that the present Roman Church holds, is not pious, good, and lawful.*

Pa. *I prove it is out of holy Writ; and by common Sense and Reason.*

Pro. *Both holy Writ, and common Sense and Reason are against you; but go on.*

Of the Popes Supremacy:

51. **P**A. *The Foundation of the Church of God; next after Christ was builded upon St. Peter, or it was not.*

Pro. *It was no more builded on St. Peter, than upon the other Apostles.*

Pa. *Why then doth the Scripture say, Mat. 16. 18. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church?*

Pro. *Christ says not there, that he will build his Church upon the Person of Peter: but upon the Confession that he had before made, vers. 16. Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God, which is the Foundation of the Christian Religion; so St. Austin explains it (Aug. trac. 10. in 1 John) What means this (saith he) Upon this Rock will I build my Church? Upon that Faith, upon that which is said, Thou*

art the Christ: seeing then Christ did not build his Church on Peter more than the other Apostles, we with good reason deny his Supremacy.

52. Pa. Christ did prefer Peter before the other Apostles, or he did not.

Pro. He did not give Peter any Preference of Order, or Power more than to the other Apostles.

Pa. If he did not, why did he say to Peter only, John 21. 16, 17, 18, feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep?

Pro. He did not say it to Peter only, St. Austin tells us, (Aug. de ago. Christ. c. 30.) when it is said unto Peter, Feed my Sheep, it is said unto all, and St. Amb. (Lib. de Sacerd.) which Sheep, and Flock, St. Peter did not receive alone, but we all received them with him. Seeing then here was no Prerogative given to Peter, but what the rest of the Apostles, and all Pastors received, we have good reason to deny his Supremacy.

53. Pa. The Apostles were of equal Authority, or they were not.

Pro. They were.

Pa. If they were, why have you Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and no equal Authority as they had?

Pro. The Question is impertinent, all Archbishops are of equal Authority in their own Provinces? All Bishops are of equal Authority in their respective Dioceses: So that we have an equal Authority. But as Bishops were under the Apostles, and Presbyters under them, so we have the same degrees, but for the Office of an Apostle, that is; no longer in the Church.

54. Pa. To whom the chief Charge of feeding Christ's Sheep was given, he was chief of the Apostles, or he was not.

Pro. He was.

Pa. Why then do you deny Peter's Supremacy, to whom the chief charge was committed.

Pro. The chief Charge was not committed to him, therefore we deny his Supremacy. And although I acknowledged that, if the chief Charge had been given to any, he had been Chief; yet seeing it was given to none, as I proved before, there was no chief over the rest.

Of Oral Tradition.

55. **PA.** *Oral and Apostolical Tradition, without written Books, either was the means of Planting and Conserving the Christian Religion, or it was not.*

Pro. It was not.

Pa. *If not, how did the Apostles propagate the Faith of Christ, without written Books ?*

Pro. They did not, but in propagating the Faith they always appealed to the Scriptures of the Old Testament ; they indeed taught the Christian Doctrine by word of Mouth, before they committed it to Writing, but that was no Tradition handed from Father to Son, which is the Tradition you plead for.

56. **Pa.** *The number of the Canonical Books are mentioned in Scripture, or they are not.*

Pro. They are not.

Pa. *If not, how do you know the Canonical Books, but by Oral Tradition ?*

Pro. By written Tradition, the Testimony of all Ages, in their Writings.

57. **Pa.** *The Christians of the Primitive Age, on pain of Damnation, held nothing for Faith, but what they had received from Christ and his Apostles for such, or they did not.*

Pro. They did.

Pa. *Why then do you deny Tradition ?*

Pro. We do not deny all Tradition : but we affirm that Tradition is not as the Council of Trent affirms, of equal Authority with the written Word ; but the Primitive Christians received their Faith from Christ, and his Apostles, by means of the Scriptures, not by means of unwritten Tradition.

58. **Pa.** *Apostolical Tradition is the Rule by which we may be infallibly assured ; both what Doctrine Christ and his Apostles taught, and what Books they wrote , or else not.*

Pro. If you can shew us any *Apostolical Tradition*, and prove it to be such, we will own it; but for *unwritten Tradition*, it is not the Rule.

Pa. If not, how otherwise can we be assured?

Pro. What *Doctrine* Christ taught, we can be assured by the *Scriptures*; what *Books* the *Apostles* wrote we can be assured by *Universal written Tradition*, the greatest *Historical Evidence*; but not by *unwritten*.

Of the Eucharist.

59. PA. That natural Body and Blood, which Christ offered upon the Cross, for the remission of Sins, it was the same which Christ gave to his Apostles, or it was not.

Pro. If you mean that material Body and Blood, it was not.

Pa. Why do you then deny that Scripture of St. Luke 22. 19. This is my Body which shall be given for you? and that Matt. 26. 20. This is the Blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the Remission of Sins?

Pro. Why do you falsify the words of St. Luke, and St. Matthew? their Words are, This is my Body which is given for you; and This is my Blood which is shed for many, not which shall be, and we deny not the Words of the Evangelists, but we deny the real Presence you assert, because Christ spake here of his real figurative Sacramental Body, not of his real natural.

60. Pa. Christ either gave his Body and Blood to his Apostles at his last Supper, or he did not.

Pro. He did.

Pa. Why then do you deny the real Presence?

Pro. We do not deny a real Presence; but a natural Corporal Presence we do; we affirm Christ to be present really and sacramentally; but not naturally, in the Body and Blood, on which he hung upon the Cross, according to that of St. Austin. (in Psal. 98.) You shall not eat that Body which was Crucified; nor drink the Blood which was shed upon the Cross.

61. Pa. When Christ said, This is my Body, did he speak Metaphorically or not?

Pro.

Pro. He did.

Pa. If he did, *prove the Metaphor out of Scripture.*

Pro. So we do, both from the words of the Institution, and the parallel places of Scripture.

1. From the Words of the Institution, *This is my Body*, either those words are to be understood in a Metaphorical Sense, or they are not; if not, then they are to be understood in a literal; if they are, then they are a Metaphor.

If they are to be understood in a literal Sense then they are either true in that Sense or they are not: If they are not, then Christ was a Liar, which is Blasphemy; if they are true in a literal Sense, then the Bread is Christ's Body, or it is not; if it is not, then those words, *This is my Body*, are false; if it be, then an Impossibility is true, for your own Authors confess that it is impossible that the Bread should be the Body of Christ literally; (Gra. de Consec. dist. 2. c. 55) But an Impossibility cannot be true, therefore the Bread is not Christ's real Body. If it be not Christ's real Body, they cannot be taken in a literal Sense therefore they must be taken in a Metaphorical.

2. From the Parallel places of Scripture, when Christ, says, *I am a Vine*, it is a Metaphor; when he says, *I am a Door*, it is a Metaphor; when he says, *I am a way*, it is a Metaphor, when he says, *this is the Cup of the New Testament*, it is a Metaphor: These are parallel Places of Scripture, all Metaphors; therefore *This is my Body*, is a Metaphor too. According to Theodoret. (Dial. immutab.) he who called himself a Vine, called the Sign his Blood.

62. Pa. The blessed Body of Christ not being contained in the Bread, can be eaten, or it cannot.

Pro. That Body, which is not contained there, viz. His Natural Body, cannot be eaten; but his Sacramental Body which is Spiritually there, may; therefore we do not maintain that we eat the Body which is not contained in the Bread; but that which is therewith given to the Faithful we do eat.

Pa. Doth it not imply a great contradiction, seeing you hold, the Body is eaten in the Eucharist, and not eaten in the Eucharist.

Pro. No. We do not say his Body is not eaten; we affirm it is, but not Carnally, but Spiritually; so that it is eaten by the Faithful, not eaten by the unworthy receiver; to maintain (as you do) that it is eaten and not eaten, at the same time by the same person, would be a contradiction; but it is none to affirm that it is eaten by the worthy, and not eaten by the unworthy receiver.

Of Liturgy in an unknown Tongue.

63. **P**A. That which the Apostles practised, is either lawful for us to practise, or it is not.

Pro. Every thing they practised is not lawful for us to practise, for some things they did, which their Extraordinary Office warranted, which is not Lawful for us to do; but every thing they practised as private Christians, is lawful for us to practise.

Pa. If it be, why do you deny the Lawfulness of the Liturgy in an unknown Tongue, seeing the Apostles had their publick Liturgies, in Greek, Syriack, and Latin.

Pro. We do not deny the Lawfulness of Liturgies in any Tongue, but we deny the Lawfulness of using them among, and imposing them upon a People, who understand not the Language they are in. And though I deny the Liturgies you speak of, to have been extant in the times of the Apostles; yet if they were, they never used a Greek Liturgy among the Latins, but among the Greeks, these several Liturgies being for the several Nations whose Language they were pen'd in.

64. **P**A. Seeing God hath commanded nothing concerning the Language of the publick Liturgy, we ought either to follow the Commands of the Church, or we ought not.

Pro. God hath commanded already, that the publick Service should be in a known Tongue, and not in an unknown; so that you suppose what is not true; the whole fourteenth Chapter of 1 Cor. forbids Prayer, or Preaching in an unknown Tongue?

• Pa.

Pa. *Why do you deny the Liturgy in an unknown Tongue, seeing the Church commands it?*

Pro. The Church doth not command it: the Roman Church indeed doth, but that is not the Church; we deny it therefore, because it crosses the ends of Prayer, which is Edification, and because God hath forbid it in the forecited place.

65. Pa. *The Man that prays and gives thanks in an unknown Tongue, either doth well, or he doth not.*

Pro. He that gives thanks or prays in a Tongue unknown to himself, doth not well: and he that publickly prays, and gives thanks in a Tongue unknown to his Auditors, doth not well.

Pa. *Why do you condemn that place of Scripture, 1 Cor. 14. 17. Thou indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified?*

Pro. We do not condemn that place. The Apostle there speaks of the matter of such a person's Thanksgiving, which he says may be good; but at the same time he condemns the manner, the doing it in an unknown Tongue, because others are not edified; and he commands, vers. 26. that all things be done to edifying. This then being a Breach of that Command, is not lawful; the Apostle says, he may give thanks well for the matter, but not in a right manner, seeing the other is not edified: For which reason we condemn the use of a Liturgy in an unknown Tongue.

66. Pa. *That which is praised in Scripture, and proved to be pleasing unto God, is either lawful and expedient for us to practise, or it is not.*

Pro. That which is proved to be pleasing to God for us to do, is lawful.

Pa. *Why then do you deny the Liturgy in an unknown Tongue? seeing the Apostle says, 1 Cor. 14. 2. He that speaketh with Tongues, speaketh not to men, but God; and vers. 14. If I pray with Tongues, my Spirit prayeth, but my Understanding is unfruitful; and vers. 30. to speak with Tongues forbid not.*

Pro. For God's sake, Sir, consider how strangely you argue, this is the very reason why we Condemn publick

Prayer in an unknown Tongue, because it is not to Edification; and because the Understanding is unfruitful, and we ought to pray with Understanding, 1 Cor. 14. 15. the Apostle here in vers. 30. commends speaking with Tongues, and so do we, but it is one thing to speak with Tongues, and another to speak in an unknown Tongue; it is not unlawful to speak to, or Pray with the People in Greek and Hebrew, if they understand it, or I, or any other, interpret it to them. But to speak or pray in a Tongue, they do not understand, without interpreting what I say, is expressly forbid by the Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 27, 28. If any Man speak in an unknown Tongue, let one interpret; but if there be no Interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church. Thus Prayers in an unknown Tongue, are so far from being recommended, that they are expressly forbidden; therefore we reject them.

Of Confession and Absolution.

67. PA. *The Apostles being made Spiritual Judges by our Lord, had power from him, to bind and loose from Sin, or they had not.*

Pro. *They had no power to bind and loose from the Guilt of Sin; but a power of binding and loosing they had.*

Pa. *Why then do you reject Absolution?*

Pro. *We do not reject it, but the Absolution of the Church of Rome we do, which pretends to more than Christ ever gave: and we also deny that it is a Sacrament as Baptism, and the Lord's Supper are.*

68. Pa. *The Laity are obliged to disclose their Faults to their Judges, or they are not.*

Pro. *If by their Judges you mean their Ministers, they are not their Judges: and they are not obliged to disclose all their faults to them.*

Pa. *If not, how can they absolve them from what they know not.*

Pro.

Pro. *Absolution* is either *general* or *particular*; the *general* is *sufficient*, except in *particular grievous Sins* which trouble the *Conscience*; for these we enjoy a *particular Absolution*: but for the *general*, it is *sufficient* for the *Ministers* to know in *general* that they are *Sinners*, and see that they *profess* to be *Penitent*.

69. Pa. *Christ* in speaking these words, whose *Sins* ye forgive, &c. *John* 20. 24. spoke true or false.

Pro. He spoke true,

Pa. Why then do you deny the power of *Absolution*?

Pro. We do not deny the power; but we condemn your abuse of it.

70. Pa. That which the *Scripture* commands, either is necessary, or it is not.

Pro. Whatever the *Scripture* commands as our *Duty*, is necessary.

Pa. Why then do you deny that of *St. James* 5. 16. Confess your faults one to another.

Pro. We do not deny it, but we say it doth not prove the necessity of *Confession* to a *Priest*, it speaks of confessing one to another, to our *Brethren*; therefore by no means proves *Confession* of all our *Sins* to a *Priest*, necessary to *Salvation*. We condemn not the use of *Confession*, but the making it necessary to *Salvation*, and part of a *Sacrament*.

Of Purgatory.

71. PA. There either is a *Penal Prison* or *Place* of temporal Punishment and Payment after this Life, or there is not?

Pro. There is not.

Pa. Why then do you falsify that *Scripture*, *Zach.* 9. 11. Thou also in the Blood of thy Covenant; hast set forth thy Prisoners out of the Pit, wherein there is no Water?

Pro. We do not falsify it; but you do; it is not Thou in the Blood of thy Covenant, but as for thee in the Blood of thy Covenant, (or whose Covenant is by Blood) I have sent forth thy Prisoners out of the Pit, wherein there

there was no Water : and it speaks not a word of Purgatory, but of the Deliverance of the Israelites, and the Redemption by the Messiah.

Pa. Why do you falsify that Text. Mal. 3. 3. He shall purify the Sons of Levi.

Pro. We do not falsify it, but we affirm it proves nothing of Purgatory, but of the Conversion, even of the Priests, by the Gospel of Christ, which we find was fulfilled, Acts 6. 7. Or if it did speak of a Purgatory it speaks only of one. for the Sons of Levi ; and therefore says nothing of such a third Place as you maintain.

Pa. But you falsify that Text, 1 Cor. 3. 15. The work of every Man shall be manifest, and yet he himself shall be saved, yet so as by Fire.

Pro. We do not ; but we say it is evident that this whole Text is an allusion to the tryal of Metals by the Fire, and all it says, is this, That he who hath beld firm the Foundation, if he hath taught any vain ungrounded Doctrins ; yet, if in the main he be found sincere, he shall be saved, but as one that scapeth out of the Fire : and therefore speaks nothing of a Place of Purification, after this Life, much less of a place of temporal Punishment ; for the Apostle doth not say he shall be saved by Fire, but so as by Fire, that is, as one that hath escaped the Fire, with much Difficulty.

Pa. But why do you falsify that Text. Mat. 5. 25. Be at an agreement with the Adversary quickly, &c.

Pro. We do not falsify it ; our Saviour speaks there of the Prison of Hell, and of no other ; therefore we say there is no ground for Purgatory in this Place, therefore we deny it.

72. Pa. Those Souls which our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, raised from Death, were either in Heaven or Hell ; or they were not : If not, why then do you deny a third Place.

Pro. I might very well except against this loose and idle way of arguing, from such unknown Points ; but I wave it, and tell you it was not necessary they should be either in Heaven or Hell.

Pa. Then

Pa. Then they must be in a third Place.

Pro. 'Tis true, but you cannot argue that because on such an extraordinary occasion God kept them in a third Place for a time; therefore there is a third Place for all to go to; but if we should grant that, there is no Consequence from hence that will prove that place a place of Punishment and Purification, if there were a third Place destined to Souls, (which we deny) yet it doth not thence follow, it must be a Purgatory.

73. Pa. Christ's descension either was into the Hell of the Damned, or it was not.

Pro. What if it was?

Pa. Then you Blaspheme.

Pro. I deny that Christ might go down there to triumph over the Powers of Darkness upon their own Ground; or for several other reasons.

Pa. But if it was not into the Hell of the Damned, it was into a third Place.

Pro. What then? was it therefore into Purgatory: suppose that Expression, he descended into Hell be meant only of the grave, or the State of the Dead, as Sheol in Hebrew, and Hades in Greek signify: what is that to Purgatory? I still affirm therefore with St. Austin (Ser. 232.) Let no Man deceive himself, for there are two Places, and there is no third; he that deserves not to reign with Christ, shall without doubt perish with the Devil.

74. Pa. When Christ Preached to the Souls in Prison 1 Pet. 3. 19. It was either to the damned, or it was not.

Pro. We are no where told that Christ went and Preached unto the Damned in Hell, or any Spirits in a separate State. That which the Apostle says, is, That there are many Spirits now in Prison, to whom Christ once Preached by his Spirit in the Ministry of Noah: So this speaking nothing, as appears from v. 20. of Christ's Preaching to Spirits already in Prison, you can draw no Argument from thence.

Of Venial and Mortal Sins.

75. **P**A. All kinds of Sin, either rob the Soul of Justice, and make her guilty of Damnation, or they do not.

Pro. Guilty of Damnation is an odd Phrase, but all kinds of Sin do make a Soul deserve Damnation, though every Sin doth not rob it of Justice, or Righteousness.

Pa. If they do, why then doth Christ make three different sorts of Sin, of which the least makes a Man guilty of Damnation? Mat. 5. 23.

Pro. If the least of them makes a Man guilty of Damnation, (as you Phrase it) then every Sin does so: and this overthrows you; but I believe you mistake your own meaning. However you beg the question, for Christ doth not there make three different kinds of Sin, but speaks of the different degrees of Punishments, alluding to the Punishments among the Jews.

76. **Pa.** All Sins are either Mortal, and sufficient to break Charity betwixt God and Man, or they are not.

Pro. In their own Nature all Sins are Mortal.

Pa. If they be, then the Apostles themselves are not in the Charity of God, seeing it is said in St. James 3. 2. We all offend in many things.

Pro. 'Tis true, the Apostles themselves had not been in the Charity of God upon that account, if the Grace of Christ had not been stronger than the guilt of those Sins: so that we do not deny, but there are Sins, which we call Sins of humane Infirmary, which in a regenerate Person are but venial, because the Grace of Christ forgives them, though in their own Nature they are mortal.

77. **Pa.** All idle Words either are mortal Sins, or they are not.

Pro. All idle sinful Words are in their own Nature mortal.

Pa. If they be, how can any one hope for Salvation, seeing

Man (morally speaking) can avoid idle words?

Pro. By the grace of Christ, pardoning those unavoidable Imperfections.

78. Pa. All Sins are even unto Death, or they are not.

Pro. If by that Expression you mean deserving Death, they are.

Pa. Then you make Christ a Liar, who said, There is Sin unto Death, and a Sin not unto Death.

Pro. It was not Christ but St. John who said so, 1 Jo. 16. But he there speaks not of a Sin which barely deserves Death, but of that Sin, which, whosoever commits it, shall certainly dye Eternally, that is, the Sin against the Holy Ghost; he doth not say there is a Sin not deserving Death, but there is a Sin, not unto Death, by which as appears 1 Jo. v. 18. he means those Sins of daily Incurſion in the regenerate, which though they deserve Death, yet they do not bring it; because the Grace of Christ covers and forgives them.

Of Invocation of Angels and Saints.

79. PA. The Enjoyment of God, Angels, Saints, and the Glory of Heaven, either robs Men of their Knowledge, or it doth not.

Pro. It doth not.

Pa. If not, why do you deny the Prophets now in Heaven can know things at a distance, as well as they did on Earth?

Pro. We deny not but God may reveal things to them in an extraordinary manner, as well as when they were on Earth; but as his revealing some things to them on Earth, did not prove they knew all things; so neither will it prove they know all things now: that Knowledge then, while here, being only particular and extraordinary, they are not rob'd of, if they have it not; but if they have it, what is that to praying to them?

30. Pa. *The damned Spirits of Hell either know more than the Blessed Souls, in the Glory of the Father, or they do not.*

Pro. They do not.

Pa. *If not, why do you acknowledge the Devils to understand our most secret Thoughts and Prayers, and not the Saints and Angels also?*

Pro. We do not acknowledge that the Devils understand our thoughts, we say, it is Blasphemy, to assert it. For God only knows the Thoughts: but we do affirm the Devils who are always about us, do know what we speak and act; but the Saints are at a distance from us, and therefore cannot; and the Angels (if the Opinion of every Persons, having one for a Guardian, be true) may possibly know the actions of those whom they are Guardians to, but this proves no knowledge of the Thoughts, nor, if they did know them, is there any Reason we should pray to them.

81. Pa. *The Angels of God have prayed for those on Earth, or they have not.*

Pro. They have not.

Pa. *Why then do you not agree with us, that Angels pray for us?*

Pro. We do agree with you that they pray for us, but what is that to our Praying to them?

82. Pa. *It is either Lawful to pray to the Angels, or it is not.*

Pro. It is not.

Pa. *If not, why do you accuse Jacob of an Error, in invoking the Angel to bless his Children? Gen. 48 16.*

Pro. Jacob did not there invoke any created Angel, but the Angel of the Covenant, the Lord Jesus Christ. So saith St. Athanasius, (orat. 4. in Arrian.) the Patriarch Jacob in his Prayer joined none with God, but him only who is the Word, whom he calls Angel; so that we do not condemn him of an Error.

Pa. *Why do you condemn this Text, Job. 5. 1. Call therefore, and turn to thee some of the Saints.*

Pro. We

Pro. We do not condemn that Text, but we may justly condemn you for alledging it after such a manner, and to such a purpose: the Words are, *Call now if there be any that will answer thee, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turn?* whereby Eliphaz upbraids Job, as unworthy of such a Privilege as he had enjoyed in Chap. 4. v. 16. of a Vision to instruct him; but says nothing of Prayer to Saints, or any thing like it.

Pa. Why do you condemn that Hos. 12. 4. Jacob prevailed against the Angel, and wept, and prayed to him?

Pro. We do not condemn it: the Prophet there speaks of the Angel which he met in Bethel, Gen. 23. 24. Which Angel was no created Angel, but Christ; for Gen. 32. 30. Jacob calls him God: now will it follow, that because Jacob worshipped God, therefore we must invoke a Created Angel? Are these Arguments for Men of Reason to use?

Of the Worshipping of Angels, and Images.

83. PA. When St. John in the Apocalypse 22. 8. fell down to adore before the Feet of the Angel, he knew it either to be lawful, or it was not.

Pro. It was not.

Pa. Then you accuse the most Wise and Excellent Apostles of gross Ignorance, and wilful Idolatry.

Pro. We do not accuse them of gross Ignorance, it was no invincible Ignorance; for it is plain, St. John took him for Christ, in that the Argument he uses to withhold him is, that he was a Created Spirit, and such an Ignorance St. John was guilty of; but for wilful Idolatry We do not accuse him, he did not, as you do, worship that which he knew not to be God, but he was about to worship that which he took for God. I wonder how you can alledge this Text in your Favour, which is so clearly against you.

Pa. Again, when Lot ador'd the Angels, Gen. 19. 1. with his Face bowed towards the Earth, he either committed Idolatry, or he did not.

Pro.

(32)
[Pro. You beg the question, Lot did not adore the Angels, the Scripture tells us, he rose up to meet them, and bowed himself with his Face towards the Ground; which was only a civil Salutation, for he took them only for Men, and therefore could not adore them: So that there is no Argument to be drawn from hence.

84. Pa. All that which is recorded in Holy Writ, to have been done by the known Saints of God without reproof, either is Lawful or it is not.

Pro. All that they so did without an extraordinary Call to it, is Lawful; but there were some things which were peculiarly lawful to them, which is not so to us.

Pa. If all things they did (as their ordinary Duty) be Lawful, then why do you call it Idolatry to worship Images?

Pro. Because the Saints of God never worshipped them.

Pa. Did not John the Baptist, the great Precursor of Christ, worship the very Latchets of our Saviours Shoes?

Pro. This is a pleasant question, where do you find he ever did? The Scripture saith no such thing; he said indeed, he was not worthy to bear them, but he never worshipped them. Prove it if you can.

Pa. Why did Jacob worship the top of Joseph's Rod, Heb. II. 21.

Pro. He did not; there is no text of Scripture that says he did; that place which you quote, is plainly perverted; for the words are, He worshipped upon the top of his Staff; that is, leaning on it; or that he worshipped leaning towards the Beds Head; and therefore St. Jerome, whose Translation you profess to follow, (in his questions upon Genesis,) rejecteth that Version, which yet you retain; we affirm then still that the Saints of God did not worship Images.

85. Pa. The holy Veneration and Worship of Images have either profited the Jews and Christians, or they have not.

Pro. They have not.

Pa.

Pa. *How then were the Israelites healed of the biting of the Serpents in the Desarts?*

Pro. *Not by worshipping any Image, no not the Brazen Serpent; but by looking on it, thereby exercising their Faith on Christ whom it was a Type of.*

Pa. *How then did the Primitive Christians receive special benefit by venerating the Shadow of St. Peter, and St. Paul? Acts 5. 15. and 19. 11.*

Pro. *Here again you suppose what is not; the Shadow of St. Peter healed many, and so did St. Paul, but they did not venerate or worship either their shadow or their Persons.*

86. Pa. *It is lawful to bow the Knee to Images, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is not.*

Pa. *If not, why doth the Apostle say, at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow? Phil. 2. 8. Which Name is nothing else but an Image of the Hearing.*

Pro. *This is as impertinent an Argument as ever I heard; the question is about graven visible material Images; not about Images in the Hearing; but pray remember St. Paul doth not say, Every Body shall worship that Name: So that it is nothing to your purpose, about visible material Images, or worshipping them.*

Of the Veneration of Reliques.

87. PA. *The Honour and Veneration of the Reliques of Saints, which God himself hath approved by many famous Miracles is good, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is.*

Pa. *Why then do you condemn the Veneration of Reliques?*

Pro. *Because God hath never approved it either by Miracles or any other way.*

88. Pa. *That Woman which was miraculously cured of the Bloody-Flux, by only touching the Hem of Christ's Garment, was Cured, either for venerating the Reliques, or she was not.*

Pro. She was not, but for her Faith.

Pa. Why then was not she Cured afar off?

Pro. That is nothing to us; it is sufficient that it was Christs Pleasure to have it as it was, and that he tells us it was by Faith she was Cured, Matt. 9. 22. Daughter (saith our Saviour) be of good Comfort, thy Faith hath made thee whole.

89. Pa. The virtue of casting out Devils, and curing the Diseases, consisted in the Napkins and Handkerchiefs, that had but touched the Body of St. Paul, or it did not.

Pro. I cannot say that it consisted in them; but it was conveyed by them.

Pa. If it was, why do you deny the veneration of Reliques.

Pro. If I should allow that the virtue of doing those Miracles did really consist in those Napkins, and Handkerchiefs, yet cannot an Argument be deduc'd from hence that we must worship Reliques; for those Napkins and Handkerchiefs were never Worshipped.

90. Pa. The Bodies of dead Saints have either restored Men to Life, or they have not.

Pro. The Bodies have not; but God by the Bodies hath.

Pa. If so, then the Reliques of Saints are worthy to be Venerated.

Pro. I deny that; by Moses's Rod, by Elizeus's Mantle, and his Bones, Miracles were wrought, yet those Reliques were never worshipped.

Of Free Will.

91. PA. God either left Man to his own Free Will, or he did not.

Pro. If you speak of the State of Man before the Fall I answer, God did leave him to his own Freewill; but since the Fall, I affirm God hath left Man to his own Free Will, as to moral Actions, but as to Spiritual, he hath not. So that we do not deny all Free Will, but only in Spiritual things.

Pa. Why do you falsify that Scripture, Eccl. 15. 14. God from the Beginning made Man, and left him in the hand of his own Counsel.

Prot. That Passage is in *Ecclesiasticus*, not in the *Canonical Scripture*, and therefore of *no Authority* in this Case ; but if it were, it speaks *nothing* of *Free Will* to *Spiritual actions* in *Men* since the *Fall* ; but of the *Power* which *Adam* had in the *Beginning*.

92. Pa. *The choice of Good and Evil is either left in Mans Free Will, or it is not.*

Pro. The *whole choice* of *Moral good and evil* is ; but the *right acceptable choice* of *Spiritual good* is *not*.

Pa. *Why then do you deny that of Joh. 24. Choose you this Day, whom you will serve ?*

Pro. We do *not* deny it ; but we say that it is *nothing* to your *purpose* : Seeing to *chuse spiritual good or evil* is in *Man's Power* ; but to *chuse it aright* is *not* ; that is, to *chuse it from a right Principle, and to a right End.*

Pa. *Why do you deny that, Joh. 1. 12. As many as received Christ, to them he gave Power to become the Sons of God.*

Pro. We do *not* deny it ; but we say that a *right choice* of *Spiritual good* is *not* in *Mans Power*, and this is *clear* from this *very Text* ; for *receiving Christ*, follows *choosing of him* ; but *ill* he gave them *more Power* than they had *before*, they could *not chuse him* so as to *become the Sons of God* ; therefore they had *no Power Natural-ly* to *chuse him aright* : So that this *Text* *overthows* your *selfes*.

93. Pa. *Man hath Power either to keep his Virgin, or he hath not.*

Pro. If you mean by that *Expression* what the *Apos- tle* intends *1 Cor. 7. 37.* I answer, he hath.

Pa. *Why then do you deny Free Will ?*

Pro. We do *not* deny *Free Will* in *moral actions*, such as *this* is, where the *Apos- tle* is only treating of the *Power* of *Guardians*, or *Parents* over the *Virgins* under their *Care* ; but that which we deny it in, is *Spiritual Actions*, of which, *this* is *no Instance*.

94. Pa. *All that God commands, is either in Man's free Power, or it is not.*

Pro. All that *God* commands *Man* to do by his own *Power* is ; but all that he commands, such as that *Precept*, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart*, is *not*.

Pa. Then you condemn God of Tyranny, in commanding that which is not in Mans Free Power to do.

Pro. That doth not follow ; as long as God will enable him to do that, for which his own free Power is not sufficient, as in the Text you cited just now, Job. 1. 12. To those, whose own Power was not sufficient, he gave Power to become the Sons of God.

Pa. But is not this as if I should threaten my Servant with horrible Death, for not bringing me the Man in the Moon ?

Pro. No, for if you did so, you would be unjust and Tyrannical, seeing your Servant could not do it ; neither could you enable him : but God requires nothing but what either Man can do, or God will enable him to perform.

Of Faith without Works.

95. PA. Faith working by Charity, either justifies, or it doth not.

Pro. Faith, properly speaking, doth not justify ; but by such a Faith we are justified.

Pa. If so, then your justifying Faith flies without Wings.

Pro. I deny that ; for there is no such a thing as a Justifying Faith without Works : we affirm, that no Faith is true, but that which worketh by Love,

96. Pa. A Man only saying, Lord, Lord, either may be Saved, or he may not.

Pro. He may not.

Pa. If not, then where is your justifying Faith ?

Pro. In the word of God, and the Heart of every true Believer, who shews his Faith by his Works.

97. Pa. You either hope to be saved by believing in God only without Works, or you do not.

Pro. We do hope to be justified, and consequently Saved, by Faith in Christ only.

Pa. Then the damned Spirits may expect Salvation, seeing they believe and tremble.

Pro. That doth not follow : that Faith which the Damned have is but an Historical Faith ; but the Faith by which we are justified, is a Faith which purifies the Soul

Soul, and is productive of good Works, which the Damned cannot have. We do not then hope to be saved by Faith without Works, but by Faith, and not by Works.

Of the Merit of Works.

98. **P**A. *Every Man will be rewarded at the last Day according to his Works or he will not.*

Pro. He will,

Pa. *If he will, then good Works will be meritorious, and receive a good Reward.*

Pro. They will receive a Reward, which they never deserved, but which by the Grace of Christ is purchased for and given to them, but not for any Merit in them; but by Virtue of his Promise and free Love, not by way, of Debt due to the Works.

99. Pa. *Christ either encouraged his Apostles to suffer Afflictions patiently in expectation of a Reward, or he did not:*

Pro. He did.

Pa. *Why then were not their Persecutions meritorious and consequently our good Works.*

~ Pro. Because the reward is not given to the desert of their Works, which bear Proportion with the greatness of the Reward; but it comes only from the pure Mercy and Grace of God, and if our good Works give us any Title to that Reward, it is not from themselves but the Promise.

100. Pa. *That Crown of Justice which St. Paul said was laid up for himself, was either the Reward of his good Fight, or it was not.*

Pro. It was,

Pa. *If it was, how can you deny the Merit of good Works?*

Pro. Because that Reward was not merited by his good Fight, but purely given to him, out of Grace.

101. Pa. *A Cup of cold Water given in the Name of a Disciple, is either Meritorious, or it is not.*

Pro. It is not.

Pa. *Why is it said then, Mat. 10. 42. That he who gives it, shall in no wise lose his Reward?*

Pro. He shall not lose the promised Reward; but what

is this to deserving that which free Grace had promised ?

Of Holy and Religious Vows.

102. **P**A. *The sacred Vows which are taught us in the Holy Scripture are lawful, or they are not.*

Pro. They are.

Pa. *Why then is not a vow lawful to us ?*

Pro. A Vow is Lawful to us ; we do not deny it, but the question is about some particular Vows, which we say are unlawful.

103. **Pa.** *The greatest Perfection of a Christian Life consists in Evangelical Poverty, or it doth not.*

Pro. It doth.

Pa. *Why then do you reject the vow of Poverty as an humane Invention ?*

Pro. Because God hath no where warranted it, the Evangelical Poverty, which so much perfects a Christian is not to renounce all Worldly goods, but to be poor in Spirit, and to be able in the midst of Plenty to despise the World, and its Riches.

Pa. *If it be not the greatest Perfection to renounce the World wholly, then why did our Saviour say to the Young-Man, Mat. 19. 21. Sell all that thou hast, and give it to the Poor ?*

Pro. Our Saviour did not there give a Precept, so to do, only to the Youngman of whom he required it by way of Trial, because he knew his Heart was set upon his Riches.

104. **Pa.** *It either was a vertue in Eunuchs, who gelded themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven, or it was not.*

Pro. That is according as you take the last Words for the Kingdom of Heavens sake; if to avoid a present violent Temptation it be done, we must commend it; but if upon mature deliberation it be done, when they might have recourse to Marriage, it is not well done.

Pa. *Why do you condemn that of St. Matt. 19. 12. There are some who have made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heavens sake ?*

Pro. VVe do not condemn the *Text*; but your *Expofition* of it; for it is doubtful on what account thofe our Saviour fpeaks of there, were Eunuchs, or whether they were fo actually, or only in *defign*; but take it in which *Sence* you will, we do not find our Saviour commends it; and it is nothing to that *flavifh Vow* which you require.

Pa. He who refolves in his Heart to keep his *Virgin*, either doth well, or not. 1 Cor. 7. 37.

Pro. He doth well.

Pa. Why then do you deny the holy *Vow* of *Continency*.

Pro. VVe condemn that *vow* which you call *Holy*, becaufe it is no where warranted in the word of God, that place of the *Apoftle* fpeaks not of any *Vow*, but if it did, it fpeaks not of *Perfonal Continency*, but of the *Power* of a *Guardian* or *Father*, in *Marrying* or not *Marrying* the *Virgins* under their *Care*.

105. Pa. We ought either to obey our *Prelates* and *Superiours*, or we ought not.

Pro. We ought in all lawful things.

Pa. Why then do you reject the *vow* of *Obedience*, as a *Popifh Fiction*?

Pro. We do not reject all *vows* of *Obedience*, but fuch as are purely *Popifh*; and thefe we condemn becaufe the matter of them is *unlawful*, not becaufe all *Vows* of *Obedience* are fo.

Pa. Our Saviour in obedience to St. *Joseph* and the *Bleffed Virgin*, either gave us an *Example* of *Obedience*, or he did not.

Pro. He did, Of *Obedience* to our *Parents*.

Pa. If he did, then the *vow* of *Obedience* is evident to be a pious action by *Chriffs* own *Example*

Pro. We do not condemn all *vows* of *Obedience* in general, (though if we had no other reason to allow them, but this *Example*, we fhould reject them; for *Chrift* here made no *Vow*, and his *Obedience* was to his *Parents*, not to *superiour* degrees in the *Church*) but yours we do becaufe of the matter of it, which you muft prove to be good, by examining the *particulars*; not by fuch general Arguments as thefe.

Of the Possibility of keeping the Commandments.

106. **P**A. A Man being assisted by the special Grace of God, can either keep the Commandments of God, or be cannot.

Pro. He can.

Pa. Why do you then deny the possibility of keeping the Commandments.

Pro. We do not deny it, we say it is not only possible ; but necessary that we should keep all the Commandments of God ; but we deny that we can keep them perfectly, that is, that we can arrive to that Degree of Perfection, as to observe them to the highest Pitch, without any defect in the manner of the Observation : this we say, None on this side Heaven can do.

107. **Pa.** It is either impossible with Man to keep the Commandments or it is not.

Pro. To keep them perfectly with a perfection of Degrees is impossible.

Pa. Why do you then accuse God of commanding Impossible?

Pro. We do not : God commands nothing but what we must perform, we must keep the Commandments perfectly, as to all the parts of them ; but as to the Degrees, by reason of our natural Corruption we cannot do it, but Christ our Surety hath done it for us.

Pa. Hearers of the Law only are justified, or they are not.

Pro. Bare Hearers are not.

Pa. If not, then the fulfilling of the Law is necessary.

Pro. That doth not follow : The doing of it is necessary, Rom. 2. 13. But for the fulfilling it as to the degrees of it that is no where required

108. **Pa.** God according to his Promise, either enabled Man to keep his Commandments, or he did not,

Pro. God enables a Man to do whatever he promises to assist him to do.

Pa. Why

Pa. *Why then do you deny in Man the Possibility of keeping the Commandments?*

Pro. *We only deny the Possibility of keeping them perfectly with a Perfection of Degrees, and God hath never promised to enable Man to do it.*

All his Promises are, that he will enable him to keep them so, as shall please him; but here is nothing of keeping them perfectly.

109. Pa. *It is evident in holy Writ, that some either keep the Commandments, or they do not.*

Pro. *None keep them with such a Perfection as I mentioned.*

Pa. *Why do you belye that of St. John 1. 6. Zacharias and Elizabeth were both just before God, walking in all the Commandments, and were justified without Blame.*

Pro. *That Text is not in St. John, but in St. Luke, 1. 6. and is not as you read it, they were justified without Blame, but they walked in all the Commandments and Ordinances of the Lord, blameless, or without Blame: Now this Text we do not bely, but we desire you to consider that St. Luke only says, they were blameless, not perfect, they were blameless, that is, they were so Holy, that no Person could find fault with them. He had spoken of their Holiness with reference to God before, and he speaks now of their Reputation among Men; but this is nothing to the keeping the Commandments perfectly, with such a Perfection as we deny.*

Of the Seven Sacraments.

110. PA. *Christ for the Sanctification of Mankind, either instituted seven visible Signs of invisible Graces or he did not.*

Pro. *He did not.*

Pa. *If he did not, answer me to these following Propositions, viz.*

Baptism is either a Sacrament, or it is not.

Pro. *It is.*

111. Pa. *Then we are agreed in that Point; but Confirmation is either a Sacrament, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is not.*

Pa. *If not, why hath it the Visible Sign, viz. Oyl and Balm?*

Pro. *It hath no such Sign of Christs Institution, which is requisite in a Sacrament, but only of your own Invention.*

Pa. *See Act. 19. 5, 6. And when Paul had imposed his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them. And Acts 8. 14, 15, 16. St. Peter and St. John did impose their Hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost.*

Pro. *These Texts speak not a word of Oyl, or Balm, practised by the Apostles, but of the laying on of Hands. Your Confirmation therefore is no Sacrament, seeing there is no Warrant of Christ for the outward Sign, nor any Divine Promise to annex an invisible Grace to it.*

112. Pa. *The Eucharist either is a Sacrament, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is.*

Pa. *Then the Controversy in this Point is ended. But to go on,*

113. *Penance either is a Sacrament, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is not.*

Pa. *If not, why hath it the visible Sign, viz. The Penitent's Confession, and the Priest's Absolution, of an invisible Grace, which is the remission of Sins?*

Pro. *There are no such Signs instituted by Christ, for Confession to a Priest is no where commanded as I shew'd before: and Absolution is only a part of Discipline, and therefore can be no part of a Sacrament; besides, here is no outward and visible Sign, which must be in a Sacrament, for the words of Absolution are the form of the Sacrament, according to the Council of Trent, now the outward Sign is never the form of a Sacrament: The matter of this pretended Sacrament being as I shew'd no where commanded by Christ, it can be no Sacrament.*

115. Pa. *Extream Unction either is a Sacrament, or it is not.*

Pro. *It is not.*

Pa. *Why then hath it the visible Sign, the Priests Prayer,*
and

of the anointing with Oyl, of an invisible Grace, James
13. 14. 15?

Pro. It hath no Sign of an invisible Grace, St. James
in that place speaks of it as a means to heal the Sick, but
that is no invisible Grace; therefore it is no Sacrament:
Whether that rite be still to be retained is another que-
stion, and not to our purpose.

116. Pa. Holy Order either is a Sacrament, or it is not.
Pro. It is not.

Pa. Why then hath it the visible Sign, the words of the
Bishop, and the things given to him that is ordained, of an
invisible Grace? according to that, 1 Tim. 4. 14. neglect
not the grace that is in thee by Prophecy with imposition of
hands of the Priesthood.

Pro. It hath no such visible Sign instituted by Christ,
which we challenge you to prove; therefore 'tis no Sacra-
ment, and neither is there any Grace given by it,
though Gifts are indeed bestowed: So that you have
falsified that Text of St. Paul, which is not, neglect not the
Grace that is in thee, but neglect not the Gift: *χαρίσματος*,
now there is a great difference between a Gift and a
Grace.

117. Pa. Matrimony either is a Sacrament, or it is not.

Pro. It is not.

Pa. If not, why hath it a visible Sign, the mutual con-
sent of both parties, an invisible Grace and Supernatu-
ral Conjunction made by Almighty God? Matt. 19. 6.
Eph. 5. 31, 32.

Pro. The mutual consent is no visible Sign, but an in-
visible Action; neither is there any Supernatural Grace
given by it, for none of those Texts you cite, mentions
any such thing: that of Eph. 5. you have falsified, St.
Paul says not, it is a Sacrament, but a Mystery, *μυστήριον*.

118. Pa. A visible Sign of an invisible Grace, Divine-
ly instituted by Christ, either is the true Definition of a
Sacrament, or it is not.

Pro. It is not.

Pa. Then you deny the Definition which your selves at-
tribute to a Sacrament.

Pro. You are mistaken, for that is only a part of the
Definition:

Definition ; we say that a Sacrament must be not only an outward and visible Sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace , Ordained by Christ ; but it must also be a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us of it : now seeing your pretended Sacraments have neither outward Signs instituted by Christ, nor invisible Graces annexed to them, and conveyed by them, we reject them and assert they are no Sacraments.

119. Pa. *Baptism and the Lords Supper is either more evidently said in Scripture, than any of the other five to be Sacraments, or they are not.*

Pro. *The word Sacrament is no where used in Scripture, and therefore Baptism is no where called a Sacrament, nor the Lords Supper : But in Scripture we find the outward and visible Sign of Baptism ordained by Christ ; and the invisible Grace annexed to it, and conveyed by it, and so of the Lords Supper ; but we find no such thing of the other five : now seeing nothing can be a Sacrament but what hath such a Sign with a Grace annexed, and Baptism and the Lords Supper have them ; we say they are Sacraments, and when you shew us the same in Scripture of the rest, we will receive them for such : It is therefore impertinent to ask us where Baptism is called a Sacrament, for we don't contend about a word ; but the question is whether Confirmation, Penance, Extream Unction, Orders and Marriage be Ordinances of the same Nature with Baptism and the Eucharist : this we deny, and we are sure you cannot prove.*

A P P E N D I X.

120. Pa. **Y**our Church either hath her succession from the Waldenses, &c. or she hath not.

Pro. *If you mean her Succession of Pastors, She hath not.*

Pa. *If not, then you must have no Succession, unless it be from the Roman Church.*

Pro. *That part of our Church which in opposition to Rome is termed the Reformed, had its Immediate Succession from the Church in communion with Rome.*

only
ritual
means
us of
either
races
them
more
to be
ture,
nor
ward
the
and
the
but
Bap-
Si-
e of
ore
ent,
n is
ders
Bap-
you
rom
ot.
it
to
ion
I,

121. Pa. Luther and Calvin either had their Mission from the Roman Church, or they had not?

Pro. They had.

Pa. If they had, the Roman Church either had the Spirit of God when they gave them that Mission, or she had not.

Pro. She had the Spirit of God, as much as was necessary for that power of giving them their Mission.

Pa. If they had, how could she fall into Errors? and why did they depart from the Spirit of God?

Pro. They did not depart from the Spirit of God: and that portion of the Spirit which she for that end had in Ordination, is only a power given by the Spirit, and therefore no security from Error, seeing all Hereticks have so much of the Spirit.

Pa. Either they had their Mission from God, or they had not.

Pro. They had.

Pa. If they had, why did not they confirm their Doctrine by Miracles?

Pro. Because Christ and his Apostles had done it before and seeing they preached no new Doctrine, there was no need of them.

122. Pa. Luther and Calvins Doctrine either was manifested to be true by Miracles, or it was not.

Pro. It was not by any Miracles wrought by them; but by the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles it was.

Pa. If they did no Miracles, then seeing you cannot alledge any Text of sacred Writ to vindicate their Tenets; you must of necessity have recourse to the private Spirit.

Pro. Are not you ashamed of such an Argument? when you know we produce Texts, plain Texts of Scripture for every one of our Doctrines, and we found them upon nothing else; and for the private Spirit, it is a thing we know not, neither do you know what you mean by it, we renounce any such thing: but the Assistance of the Spirit of God we own and pray for.

123. Pa. The Apostles either had the private Spirit, or they had not.

Pro. What you mean by the private Spirit, is best known to your self: But that Assistance of the holy Spirit which we hope for, and God hath promised, they had.

Pa:

Pa. If they had, why then did they call a Council? Acts 15.

Pro. I appeal to your self, whether that is an Argument that they had not even a greater, viz. An infallible Assistance of the Spirit attending every one in particular, which if they had, you cannot deny them the Assistance we plead for.

24. Pa. Your private Spirit either is of God, or it is not.

Pro. The Assistance of the holy Spirit promised and given to every private Man, who seeks it with Humility and Prayers, is of God.

Pa. Why then are there so many disagreeing Sects among you?

Pro. There are no disagreeing Sects among us in matters of Faith, in which alone the Assistance of the Holy Spirit is given.

125. Pa. A Man endowed with your private Spirit either can interpret Scripture, or he cannot.

Pro. A Man endowed with the Spirit of God (which is the only assisting Spirit) can interpret Scripture aright.

Pa. If they can, what need have you of Preachers?

Pro. To instruct the ignorant, to convince the erroneous, to stir up the negligent, to excite the slothful, to comfort the Broken-hearted, and Administer the holy Sacraments.

Pa. But after all, no Man will believe any thing but what his Spirit suggests unto him.

Pro. No Man ought to believe any thing but what the Spirit of God suggests unto him, either by the Scriptures, the Law of Nature, or internal Convictions; for which he makes use of Ministers as the Means.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT.

I Desire the *Gentlemen* against whom I write, would deal so fairly with me; as to let me and the *World* know what *Scandals* and *Calumnies* they aim at in their *Caution* to their *Adversaries*, and who they are, who they say could never learn to speak or write *Truth*, and what those sores are which they threaten to rip up; a few words will explain their meaning, which is there a little dark.
